

Dialogue between FfD Co-Facilitators, civil society and business - 29 January 9:00am EST (NY)

Notes/Commentary

- There was a 7-minute delay in starting the web stream, so a large part of the chairman's discussion was cut off
- Towards the end of the discussion, there were quite some technical difficulties on the side of the organizers, so it was hard to hear the speakers
- Only few of the speakers introduced themselves by name/organization, so we decided to organize the summary based on overarching topics of discussion rather than individual speaker's points
- Since the meeting was only 45 minutes long, discussion stayed rather vague and was more concerned with procedure than content

Co-Chair's Introduction

The first Co-Chair pointed out that although many of the topics on the agenda of the FfD3 have been topics of individual conference, it is the role of FfD3 to create an inclusive process for a broader agenda that draws together points from different agendas, find points of intersection and develop models, policies and approaches to find an overarching agreement. He raised the question whether FfD3 should be more of a box that can fit every possible item into it or a platform that allows for more flexibility for an evolving agenda. Furthermore, the Co-Chair emphasized the need for increased technology use and the advance of innovation to solve questions of climate change, limited oil supply and renewable energies. While emphasizing that developing and developed countries need to find a common agreement that works for both sides, he ended his introduction with, "We only have questions, we don't have answers".

Stick to previous agreements (Monterrey/Rio) or reinvent the wheel?

There was a strong statement by the first speaker representing civil societies that the FfD3 should stick to the Monterrey Consensus¹ because anything else would imply losing important progress for NGOs. The speaker articulated the desire for linking and framing FfD3 through Monterrey and Doha. Another speaker extended this to not only pertain to civil society but also climate change solutions; political and non-binding statements made within the FfD3/SDG context should not interfere with the Paris Declaration or any other legally binding agreement that promotes accountability. There was general consensus to not have to rebuild the whole house / reinvent the wheel.

The Co-Chair opened this up for discussion by asking how the financing framework can be useful in addressing multiple (often cross-cutting) challenges. Another delegate replied by indicating that the financing framework should work as a platform upon which further action can be implemented, that fills holes from Monterrey (e.g. support for SMEs, rule of law) and that enumerates sources of financing. Delegates discussed the ways that trade can function as a

¹http://siteresources.worldbank.org/KFDLP/Resources/461197-1122319506554/What_is_the_Monterrey_Consensus.pdf

means of financing development, as well as the opportunities in which data can measure capital flows and promote tax cooperation. One particular speaker mentioned the need to continue implementing current successful measures, including the International Transparency Initiative, in which actors were able to properly measure money flows from sources to results.

Inclusion of Not Mentioned Topics

One speaker brought up the emergence of urban development and the potential role of cities and municipalities in local financing. These urban centers would be great resources to tap into for the purposes of developing solutions to climate change and technology.

Another speaker also mentioned the need to integrate judicial and legislative system into sustainable development. Goals such as tax cooperation cannot be achieved without the investment in judges, lawyers, and more modern and effective civil procedures.

Division of Main Body vs Annex

Considerable time was spent discussing which parts of the declaration should be part of the main body and which should be presented in the annex. There was a strong call to clearly outline solutions in the main body and leave unclarified areas of discussion to the annex where they could only confuse and inhibit action.

Tailoring suggestions to fit policy-makers

One of the central difficulties in drafting the FfD3 is the fact that although many of the issues addressed are cross-cutting (capacity-building, climate change, technology), there should be a way in which the declaration specifically addresses the role pivotal change-makers can play (national and subnational government, cities, civil society). To this end, one speaker finds, one should draw on piloted and proven financial structures involving inter alia the private sector.

Way forward

One delegate suggested setting up dedicated days for civil society and business to enable a two-way dialogue rather than gathering people in a multi stakeholder meeting.

The meeting adjourned with a commentary by the second Co-Chair who called on delegates to draw on closer links to the SDG agenda and not be “that conservative”. His suggestion was to build on the three pillars from Rio and to focus on finding answers to address poverty and climate change cohesively. The Co-Chair also emphasized that he hopes civil society and business will make their voices heard in Addis Ababa, but this would require strong coordination with regional and provisional partners.

Added Notes

Co-Chair #1 introductions:

1. box v. platform → should we retain the box of Rio de Janeiro +20 or should we diversify and accept different perspectives across platforms
2. the importance of increased technology use → needs to be efficient and effective

3. developing countries have a bigger constituency than the G20 → we need something that works for us as well
4. we shouldn't be "baptizing" new initiatives but also not discredit ideas that are already in place → the need to adapt existing ideas to work for the developing countries implementing them
5. emphasis on division of labor, cooperation,
6. "We only have questions, we don't have answers."

First Speaker (civil society):

- have raised concerns in the past about civil society participation → Thanks!
- if we want Monterrey and Doha to be remembered, we have to speak within the framework that was discussed before
- how to solve climate change: there have been previous conferences and legal binding agreements, but if we start this conference here, there might be legally binding frameworks taking place in other places that will be undermined by political, nonbinding statements made here
- we are not against addressing new issues, but why do we have rebuild the whole house?

Co Chair #1:

- Thank you for disciplined intervention
- We have tried to keep as close to the Monterrey framework; we don't want to throw out the baby with the bathwater
- We are not going to solve climate change in any one place and we don't want to undermine the strength of commitments needed to take place in Paris in December
- How can we be helpful? What is it in terms of the finance framework that can be useful in addressing these multiple challenges going forward?
- How do we design an approach that takes real connections into account?

Second Speaker (business/private sector?):

- comments linked to Elements Paper
- understands the need for a deliverable to finance the whole development agenda
- FMD lacked real, robust follow up at the intergovernmental level in terms of an accountability mechanism
- Monterrey: actionable parts of plan were in the declaration
- How are the concrete proposals delineated and where will these actions take place in a global level?
- We will remain constructively engaged

Third Speaker:

- We all recognize this as a platform in which our message is that our platform works best in that structure
- There are issues that were not absent in Monterrey, but when those issues become a separate pillar that affects what happened there

- We can ask why there are significant issues missing in Monterrey documents
- The solution: Monterrey structured around structures around finance
 - trade isn't really in finance but since it affects finance, it has been included
 - the same idea is a good guiding criteria for any other issue
 - data measuring capital flows and tax cooperation → technology has financial aspects, but it doesn't belong in Monterrey

Fourth Speaker:

- solutions should be embedded in the main text
- What is the value of the UN? → the value added of what is done here is the conceptualization of what governments and its stakeholders need to do to make a better world
- many of these financial variables are cross-cutting
- whether the issues are climate change, technology, or capacity building → systematically we should challenge ourselves on developing solutions to capacity building, leveraging ourselves responsibly (not setting the private sector at a higher, advantageous level), increasing commitments from sub-national to central government, increasing performance metrics
- we need a technical basis for looking at flows
- we already have a lot of financial structures that have piloted and worked but are not in the document → we need to pull from the experiences of countries, the private sector, and stakeholders and include

Fifth Speaker:

- no reference to local authorities/ metro areas → those are 4 billion people accumulated in these cities!
- on the urbanization problem: these challenges are crucial
- local financing and the role of cities/municipalities → these are other sources that we can tap into that collide with technology and climate change

Sixth Speaker:

- efforts and outcomes need to be implemented after they're agreed on
- importance to build on existing initiatives → helpful to society to be accountable
- International Transparency Initiative → we have been able to track money flows from source to results
- lots of progress made over the 4 years → influential donors have been using this initiative and the results show
- we should recognize the work behind this initiative and how it can support other endeavors

Seventh Speaker:

- almost everyone from every sector has been mobilized except for ministries of justice and legal structures (judiciary)

- tasks cannot be corrected or enforced without investment in judges, lawyers, and more modern and effective civil procedures

Eighth Speaker:

- civil society and private sector hearings will take place in March
- need for coordination and facilitation in civil society: we need advanced information as to how to participate in the forum and the financing of said participation in the hearings
- regional preparatory meetings: how will these be organized?
- civil society forum in Addis Ababa: we would like to start engaging in a discussion not only about the forum but the spaces that could be provided in AA to make noise about financing for development to get media and international attention

Ninth Speaker (Barbara Adams, Global Policy Forum):

- some concerns about the structure: should we have more clarity for means of implementation? → related to SDGs, 17 goals, and Doha and Monterrey procedures

Tenth Speaker (Fiji):

- we also invite those from LDC and others: part of the challenge for us is to engage in the region itself and in Addis Ababa itself

Eleventh Speaker:

- we need a way to organize our deliverables: a constructive business forum at the conference is necessary
- these hearings are the opportunity for civil society and business to share our views with member states in intergovernmental processes
- the UN is unique in bringing many actors to the table → these hearings are the opportunity for a two-way dialogue, but not a multi stakeholder process
- Thanks for this consultative process!

Twelfth Speaker:

- there are positives and negatives in this context in integrating social, environmental, and economic pillars in financing for development
- how can we specifically operationalize suggestions from the systemic issues into the text?
- we need to include a follow up mechanism
- environmental sustainability in capital markets → we need to give examples of specific things taking place
- while implementing climate changes is necessary, that means different things in different countries
- an example: UNEP initiative → Ecological Risk Dissolving Credits?
 - it combines different structures to talk about climate changes

Co-Chair #2:

- some of you seem delinked from the process

- some of you are too conservative in your approach → this is the challenge
- if you focus on structure, that's great but this will not bring us further
- we need building blocks of Monterrey
- we also need the 3 pillars from Rio → without them, this will become a failure
- hope to fight poverty and climate change at the same time
- please try to see that this is about implementing the three pillars
- on the process: co-chairs will make sure that civil society and business will continue to be part of this, make sure you are in touch with regional, provisional partners
- in AA: your voices should be heard loudly and clearly, we are working with Secretariat on this, we are hoping to be a bit more creative in our approach, hopefully this is a beginning
- You have until the 12th of February to develop a transformative agenda and to implement it